

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3 are pending in this application, both of which have been amended in order to more clearly define the invention. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated May 11, 2007.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §.112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Reconsideration and removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action alleges that Claim 1 contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The phrase, “a substrate, composed of glass and a resin,” is not previously described.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, “...substrate, composed of glass or a resin” removal of the 35 U.S.C. §.112, first paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Reconsideration and removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action alleges that in Claim 1 the dial plate claims a “substrate does not comprise a printed circuit board.” However, the substrate requires “a metal electrode printed on the substrate.” A printed circuit board is described as a circuit for electronic apparatus made by depositing

conductive material in continuous paths from terminal to terminal on an insulating surface. This claim language is indefinite because, the Office interprets the substrate with a printed metal electrode to be a printed circuit board.

Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to remove the mention of a printed circuit board. Removal of the 35 U.S.C. §.112, second paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is objected to by the Examiner because the first instance of “the substrate” has improper antecedent basis and will be interpreted as “a substrate.”

Accordingly, Claim 3 has been amended to correct this matter. Removal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Macher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,641,276). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 1, the Office Action alleges that Macher et al. teaches a dial plate for use in an instrument panel of a vehicle, having laminated patterns of light emitting elements (2), the laminated patterns being formed on a substrate (4), composed of a glass or resin, which substrate does not comprise a printed circuit board, by laminating electroluminescent materials through printing, a metal electrode printed on the substrate, an emitting layer (2) printed on the metal electrode, and a transparent electrode formed on the emitting layer, and having a specific design corresponding to external data.

With respect to Claim 3, the Office Action alleges that Macher et al. teaches a method for producing a dial plate for use in an instrument panel of a vehicle, having the steps of receiving external data; and forming laminated patterns on a substrate (4) of the dial plate by laminating electroluminescent materials (2) through printing, by at least printing a metal electrode on a substrate, an emitting layer (2) on the metal electrode, and a transparent electrode on the emitting layer, whereby the laminated patterns have a specific design corresponding to the external data.

Claims 1 and 3, as now amended, define a dial plate, and a method for producing, having a specific sequence of materials used for the laminated patterns. The materials are printed directly on specific other materials of the device, as shown in fig. 3D.

It is respectfully submitted that Macher et al. does not disclose or suggest such specific sequence of materials. In particular, Macher et al. does not describe an emitting layer printed directly on a first electrode. In Macher et al., an insulating or dielectric layer is provided between a first electrode and the emitting layer, as described at column 2, lines 14-21.

It is respectfully submitted that the present invention is patently distinct and non-obvious in view of Macher et al.

On August 28, 2007, the undersigned conducted a personal interview with Examiner Makiya and his supervisor.

It was agreed that the amended claim language should overcome the Macher reference.

It was further agreed that “consisting of” rather than “comprising” be used in order to avoid the Macher use of an insulating or dielectric layer as discussed at column 2, lines 14-21 of the

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/808,509  
Preliminary Amendment

reference, and also on other language to clarify the claims.


In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 3, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

  
for William G. Kratz, Jr. 2773  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 22,631

WGK/ak  
Atty. Docket No. 040155  
Suite 400  
1420 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time  
Request for Continued Examination Transmittal